Application Serial No.: 10/796,882 Response dated October 26, 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Radunsky, et al. Attorney Docket No.: 3154/103

App. No.: 10/796,882 Art Unit: 1797

Filing Date: 03/08/2004 Examiner: Drodge, Joseph W.

For: Method and System for Colloid Exchange Therapy

Mail Stop Amendment

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Reply to Interview Summary Mailed October 11, 2007

Dear Sir:

In response to the Interview Summary Mailed October 11, 2007, applicant responds as follows:

Substance of the Interview

- 1) Exhibits. No exhibits were shown or discussed.
- 2) <u>Identification of claims discussed.</u> As indicated in the Interview Summary, claims 17 and 24-44 were considered.
- 3) Identification of prior art discussed. The Roberts reference was discussed.
- 4) <u>Identification of principal proposed amendments discussed.</u> The amendments discussed were those introduced in applicant's response, to the office action mailed July 25, 2007 submitted on September 24, 2007.
- 5) <u>Brief identification of general thrust of principal arguments presented to the examiner.</u> As elaborated in the response to office action submitted on September 24, 2007, the Roberts reference does not teach the circuit, molecular weight cutoff, nor sieving functionality of the device as claimed.

Application Serial No.: 10/796,882 Response dated October 26, 2007

6) General Indication of any other pertinent matters discussed. The restriction status of

newly added claims 24-44 was discussed.

7) General results or outcome. Applicants agree with the Interview Summary with minor

exceptions. No agreement regarding the circuit limitation was reached because agreement

regarding the lack of molecular weight cutoff feature rendered this point moot with respect to

the existence of anticipation. The Interview Summary indicates discussion of claim 1, but

this claim is currently canceled. The Interview Summary also indicates agreement regarding

the lack of a restriction requirement for newly added methods claims 24 – 44; however, the

restriction decision is at the discretion of the Examiner. Applicants indicated a preference for

the issuance of a restriction requirement.

Applicant submits that all claims pending in the application are allowable over the art

of record. Early notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. Reconsideration of the

application and issuance of a notice of allowance are respectfully requested. It is believed

that no extension of time is required, but Applicant hereby petitions for and request that any

extension or other fee required for timely consideration of this application be applied and

charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4972. The Examiner is requested to telephone the

undersigned if any matters remain outstanding so that they may be resolved expeditiously.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert A. Hess, #57,411/

Robert A. Hess

Reg. No. 57,411

Bromberg & Sunstein LLP

125 Summer Street, 11th Floor Boston, MA 02110-1618

(617) 442 2222

(617) 443-9292

Agent for Applicant

2